

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR
BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



U.S. Pat. Off.

Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

Is Universal Military Training Necessary for Our Defense?

Acting Moderator, ORVILLE HITCHCOCK

Speakers

ARTHUR H. COMPTON

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY

DANIEL A. POLING

HOMER P. RAINEY

(See also page 13)

COMING

—April 6, 1948—

How Can We Meet the Challenge of Russia's
Expansion in Europe?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.





CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF MARCH 30:

"Is Universal Military Training Necessary for Our Defense?"

<i>Mr. HITCHCOCK</i>	3
<i>Dr. POLING</i>	4
<i>Dr. RAINEY</i>	6
<i>Dr. COMPTON</i>	8
<i>Senator McCARTHY</i>	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN	13
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!	17



THE BROADCAST OF APRIL 6:

"How Can We Meet the Challenge of Russia's Expansion in Europe?"



The Broadcast of March 30, 1948, originated in Ellis Auditorium, Memphis, Tennessee, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., EST., over the American Broadcasting Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send Subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



MARCH 30, 1948

VOL. 13, No. 49

Is Universal Military Training Necessary for Our Defense?

Moderator Hitchcock:

Good evening, friends. We are happy tonight to be in Memphis as the guests of Lowenstein's, one of the South's finest department stores, and Station WMPS, owned by one of the Nation's outstanding industries, Plow, Inc. I am especially glad to be able to substitute as moderator for my friend, George Denny, with whom I was formerly associated.

Mr. Denny wanted so much to be here in Memphis for this broadcast, but was unavoidably detained at the last minute in New York. He will be back with you again next week in his familiar role when Town Meeting originates from Beaumont, Texas.

You will remember that thirteen days ago, on March 17, President Truman, in the midst of a critical world situation, appeared before Congress to ask it to revive Selective Service and to adopt a plan of Universal Military Training.

Hearings on these two important

proposals began immediately and they will be hotly debated during the next few weeks. This is a debate in which you and I should have a part.

The military training proposal cuts into every home in this country. It has special meaning for the high school and college boys who are at or near the proposed training age. It is of vital concern to their parents. It is a question that is close to the veteran.

In fact, in a world even now engaged in what is so aptly called a cold war, none of us can avoid meeting squarely these matters of security and preparedness.

The debate in Congress will revolve around the report of President Truman's Advisory Committee on military training. Briefly, the plan would mean the induction into special training units each year of approximately 850,000 boys between the ages of 18 and 20.

These boys would be given basic

training for the first six months. To fill out the remainder of their year of service, they would elect one of a number of options, such as enlistment in the National Guard, or other choices in scientific and educational fields.

The question is: Do we need now, for our national defense, a training program of this kind?

To present both sides of the issue we are fortunate tonight to have as our speakers four able authorities, Dr. Arthur H. Compton, chancellor of Washington University, St. Louis; Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of *Christian Herald*; Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin; and Dr. Homer P. Rainey, president of Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri.

First, let's hear from Dr. Poling, editor of *Christian Herald*, who has just returned from the Grand Canyon in Colorado, where he conducted the Sunrise Service on Easter Morning. Dr. Poling was a member of President Truman's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training. Dr. Daniel Poling. (*Applause.*)

Dr. Poling:

I believe, Senator McCarthy and Dr. Rainey, that military training, universal and compulsory, as recommended by the President's Civilian Advisory Commission, is necessary for our defense. I believe that it is imperative now.

The heaviest attacks on UMT

have been made by those who have insisted upon confusing Universal Military Training with conscription and the draft. The call of the Government for UMT and a draft vindicates the good faith of the President's Civilian Advisory Commission.

More important, it further emphasizes the imperative need of UMT both as a plan for the Nation's defense and as a program toward peace.

Dr. Compton and I believe that standing alone it is inadequate for the Nation's defense, but without it there can be no adequate defense. It is an essential element imperatively required in an integrated program of national security: first, to safeguard the United States, and, second, to enable us to fulfill our responsibilities to the cause of world peace and the success of the United Nations.

It is a step towards universal disarmament. It is against war and toward peace. A weak America would more quickly destroy the United Nations than any possible withdrawal from it, or direct attack upon it.

Just as war could not be isolated, peace cannot be. For us, the assurance of national security and the promise of world peace are one.

If we object to this training in principle because it is universal and compulsory, then we are bound to raise a voice against taxation and education, where within the definition they are both universal and

compulsory. But, if in another crisis we induct the trainee without training, he would again become the hapless victim of his country's sad neglect.

UMT as recommended has been demonstrated by the experimental unit at Fort Knox. It provides moral safeguards for civilian trainees, with opportunities for religious guidance under the several faiths, and with recognition of the status of the conscientious objector, unique in the history of the Nation's defense.

Military authorities are committed to the Fort Knox program. I am convinced that it can be generally applied. I will support no bill that does not include these moral safeguards and religious opportunities. A nation's defense must be, first of all, mental, moral, and spiritual, and the peace of the world holds with these.

A religious faith is a mightier bulwark for a people than armies and fleets, but such a national defense program as we recommend is as imperative as is a police force for a community. When we ask for ourselves no security we would not share, then, men and women, the bulwarks of freedom are doubly strong.

Here are my arguments in a nutshell. Senator McCarthy and Dr. Rainey, I shall be interested in your answers.

UMT is necessary for our defense because without it we cannot bring the National Guard and the

organized reserves to strength. Despite the most successful volunteer recruiting program in the history of this or any other country, our defense forces are approximately 350,000 below minimum strength fixed two years ago.

It is necessary because without it civilian components cannot be made efficient and the next war would be a civilians' war. All would be in and all should be prepared.

It is necessary because without it in a crisis full mobilization will involve costly and perhaps fatal delay. It is necessary because without it in any crisis we would lack trained manpower for civilian defense. UMT is not a plan to create a mass army. It is a scientific answer to the question, "How can America find and train specialists for a possible atomic world crisis?" Universal conflict would require universal mobilization and universal mobilization without universal training would be confusion, panic, and disaster.

It is necessary for our defense because without it we cannot set up a working partnership between the civilian and the military—a dynamic intelligent unity for national and world security. As recommended, it provides an overall civilian administration with two civilian commissioners, a third from the armed forces, and with a civilian executive administrator. All military training, Senator Mc-

Carthy, would be where it belongs—with the armed forces.

Finally, UMT, as recommended is necessary because training saves lives. In two wars, the United States has committed its sons to danger and death unconditioned, unprepared. Again and again on the Western Front in World War I, and over the whole earth, on land and sea and in the air, in World War II, I saw young Americans unconditioned, undisciplined, unprepared, brought to the front and thrown into combat. To again repeat that failure—to again repeat that failure—would be for me a mortal sin. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Hitchcock:

Thank you, Dr. Poling. Now let's hear the arguments against military training from one of the country's leading educators, Dr. Homer P. Rainey, president of Stephens College. Dr. Rainey has held a number of important college presidencies including Franklin, Bucknell, Texas, and now Stephens, finding time in between to play a little professional baseball with the Texas League and to direct the American Youth Commission. We are happy to hear his views on Universal Military Training. Dr. Rainey. (*Applause.*)

Dr. Rainey:

I regret to find myself in opposition to Dr. Poling and Chancellor Compton. We have been on the same side of many issues but

I cannot go along with them on this one. I simply do not agree, Dr. Poling, that this proposal is a step toward disarmament or a road to peace or a sound basis of national security.

On the contrary, I think it will cause a loss of confidence in our moral leadership. It will produce fear of war around the world and encourage an unprecedented program of rearming.

It places our national security almost wholly upon a basis of military force and neglects the moral, political, economic, and other factors of national security. Your own Advisory Committee, Dr. Poling, recommended a much more inclusive program of seven other factors. The President's appeal ignores all your other recommendations and asks only for a draft and for universal military training.

I am representative of nearly three-fourths of all American educators of all types who are opposed to peacetime universal military training. The educational forces of this country have given long and careful consideration to this issue and to the President's request.

We feel that it would weaken those aspects of security which are essential, that it would create a false sense of security, that it would have a harmful effect upon our youth, that it is contrary to the basic tenets of peacetime democracy, and that it would jeopardize

dize our efforts to secure peace through international cooperation.

It turns our back upon the United Nations and collective security. It is based upon an unsound conception of future war.

It is highly unrealistic in the atomic age and repeats the historical blunder of always preparing to fight the last war.

It is also based upon an unsound conception of what our foreign policy should be—that of imposing our will by force.

Its purpose, says the President, is to frighten and overawe Russia. Will it, I ask you? If Russia is not frightened by the greatest navy in the world, by the greatest air force, by production capacity ten times greater than her own and a huge pile of atom bombs, is it possible that she is going to be frightened by a million boys drilling and marching around in camps? For every boy we can put into a training camp, Russia can put three or four, simply because she has that many more youths between 16 and 25 years of age than we have.

It is also based upon the unsound conception that we're fighting armies and not fighting ideas. It is communism that is our enemy, and we could win every military engagement around the world and communism could and probably would continue to spread. That is exactly what our policy in China is doing today.

We've simply got to fight ideas

with better ideas. We've got to make democracy more attractive than communism or all the military strength in the world won't save us. A billion and a half people — three-fourths of the world's population—are have-nots and are underprivileged. They want bread, houses, and freedom from want and fear.

Throughout our national history, we have been the moral champion of these underprivileged peoples. The only way we can defeat communism is to do more for them than communism can possibly do. We simply can't win by being merely anti-Communist. We have to make the values of democracy more desirable and more exportable than those of communism.

A lot of us, too, Dr. Poling, are just plain scared at the unprecedented subordination of our foreign policy and of our national life to the military. Never before have we been so much under the domination of the military.

We simply do not want universal military training for fear of what it will do in further regimenting the minds of our people. Military training and democracy are just not compatible. Such a program is on the side of military bureaucracy, which is the worst of all forms of bureaucracy. It is on the side of the centralization of power, the federalization of schools and colleges, and the maintenance of oppressive taxation.

The President looks upon this

plan as an educational program. With the Army as the educational agency, our whole educational system would be under the military drill master.

Furthermore, the cost of such a program would be enormous. Consider what we could do with two billion dollars a year—which this program would cost. We could give 1,000 colleges, two million dollars each year. This would more than double their present endowment every year. Think of it!

Or we could build and equip and operate 2,000 hospitals a year and each succeeding year thereafter.

Or we could build 400,000 homes a year, costing \$5,000 each.

Or we could finance 2,000,000 boys in school each year at a cost of \$1,000 each.

Or, for the cost of a million conscripts, we can provide from four to seven years of academic, professional, or technical training for these same youths.

Finally, it is not the type of education and leadership that are needed in the world today. It is based upon force, which is negative and unmoral. It is making us the victim of militarism, which we have fought two world wars to stamp out of the world.

We need a faith in and an education for a peaceful and cooperative world—one that brings hope rather than hopelessness and despair.

We need to throw our might

and our great political prestige behind the high moral and political ideals for which all mankind are struggling and which they will all support. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Hitchcock:

Thank you, Dr. Rainey. Now we will hear from Dr. Arthur H. Compton, Nobel prize winner, atomic scientist, and chancellor of Washington University at St. Louis. He was a member of the advisory committee to the Manhattan Project, and was Director of the United States Government's plutonium research project during the war. As I am sure you know, he is a member of one of the most distinguished families of American educators. I am happy to present Dr. Compton, speaking to you from St. Louis, Missouri. Dr. Compton. (*Applause.*)

Dr. Compton:

Like Dr. Poling, I also consider universal training to be an essential part of our program of national defense. I share with Dr. Rainey the view that our best defense lies in preventing war from occurring. But I must add that peace itself is not enough. Certain values are worth more even than the risk of life. Among these values are freedom and justice.

So, on the one hand, we endeavor, even to the point of using force, to prevent developments that would lead to major wars; and, on the other hand, we en-

courage developments that should help to establish a stable peace.

At the same time, we must recognize that peace with freedom is precarious in a warlike world. We must be prepared to fight a war successfully if it should come. The penalty for unpreparedness is that of Czechoslovakia or China; the penalty of defeat is that of Poland or Germany.

Let me point out where universal training fits among the factors that contribute to the Nation's safety. These factors may be divided into four:

First, there's armed defense.

Second, there's political adjustment to provide mutual protection and to encourage healthy interchange between nations.

Third, you have the promotion of international business, cultural, educational activities that lead to closer economic ties, better understanding, and greater concern among the nations for each others' welfare.

Fourth, you have building the internal strength of our Nation.

All four of these are factors required to provide security. There's no time for me to discuss the second and third of these factors though these are essential. But I do want to explain how universal training is directly concerned with maintaining our armed defenses and how it can be important also in developing our internal strength.

For adequate defense, we need

trained men, as well as powerful weapons. The statement is frequently made that in the next war we shall fight with long-range weapons, and very few men will be required for our armed forces. Dr. Rainey has expressed the fear that armed forces might become a Maginot Line, in that we would come to rely upon our army when it is really inadequate to protect us. In fact, the reverse is true.

Both long-range weapons and men are needed. We are now relying so completely on our powerful long-range weapons that we do not have the armed manpower strength to prevent the kind of imminent aggression that can't be stopped by atomic bombs or even by airplanes and navies. We are in danger of getting in difficulty because we are relying on weapons, not men.

One of the most important defense values of atomic weapons is their availability for retaliation against aggression. If we make it clearly known that forcible restriction of the freedom of peoples within the boundaries that we pledge ourselves to defend will be considered as a hostile act, and that, if performed, we must retaliate with atomic weapons, we may be able to prevent this aggression from occurring.

What we really need is the combination of preparedness to retaliate in this manner, the presence of armed guards that will make aggression both difficult and evi-

dent, and readiness to develop quickly a well-balanced fighting force in case hostilities do begin.

When an emergency arises, such as the one now before us, universal training won't supply the immediate need. Such immediate requirements are, in my view, best supplied by selective conscription. But conscription itself would be more promptly effective if young men of draft age were already prepared by a year of universal training.

Now, we don't have such a training as a background, and its equivalent will have to be provided before the new recruits can become effective. Our defense preparations are thus delayed.

It's my firm opinion also that, if wisely carried out along the lines of the report of the President's Commission, universal training will improve the internal strength of the Nation. Thus, for example, we shall bring into close association young men of all the many groups of which the Nation is composed. The better understanding that must develop when they are engaged side by side on common duties, can't help but create a truer democracy.

I know that Senator McCarthy will share my intense concern lest the American people let their love of peace prevent them from seeing the rising hazards of war until it's too late, lest we take the easy course, and thus drift to disaster by unwillingness to act against in-

justices or to support the democratic nations that form our outer bulwarks.

We are now giving the impression that we will not protect our freedom. It was lethargy like this that lead Japan and Germany to believe that we wouldn't take steps to block their aggression.

We know our own psychology. We know that, when we are pressed hard enough, we will fight with everything we have to protect the freedom that we cherish. But others don't know us. They are misled by our reluctance to move.

They do not see the latent will to war that rises inside of us when we're presented with threats and injuries so they carry on their aggression until we become fighting mad. Then war is upon us.

This has been the history of the beginning of both world wars. It can easily happen again. The best protection against such catastrophe is to make it evident that we are prepared, to make it evident that we will protect our freedom. Only thus can we hope to prevent acts of aggression that must eventually lead to war.

I consider universal training essential if we are to keep prepared to protect our freedom and that of those who must depend upon us. *(Applause.)*

Moderator Hitchcock:

Thank you, Dr. Compton. We had a little difficulty hearing you

in the auditorium here in Memphis partly because of a violent rain-storm which just started. The noise on the roof masking just a bit your voice, so you'll have to bear with us slightly in the round table discussion which we'll have in a minute, so that we can hear you.

Now we'll hear from one of our younger national legislators, Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin and member of the Senate's Special Committee to investigate the national defense program. Senator McCarthy saw service in the South Pacific with the Marines during World War II and can speak with authority from the point of view of the veterans. Senator McCarthy. (*Applause.*)

Senator McCarthy:

Thank you. Dr. Poling, Dr. Rainey, Dr. Compton, and—can I safely say—Tennessee fellow Republicans. (*Applause.*) Before we commence a discussion of this subject, let me make it clear I wholeheartedly favor the maintenance of a powerful military force. Perhaps one of our greatest contributions to world peace will be the maintenance of a powerful fighting force until such time as we are convinced that whatever international machinery we set up for the maintenance of peace actually will work. Then and only then can we afford a weaker military force.

However, I do take issue with those who claim that peacetime compulsory training is the way in

which to make ourselves strong from a military standpoint.

The vast majority of those who advocate a peacetime draft are good, honest, sincere, patriotic men. This, ladies and gentlemen, makes the whole picture doubly dangerous. It indicates that we as a Nation are still thinking in terms of World War I. It indicates that a vast number of men still equate national security and armed strength with a large reserve infantry force.

Now in deciding whether UMT is necessary or wise, a number of facts must be kept in mind. First, war is the science of death and destruction, a highly developed science, a science requiring a great number of experts, school technicians in many lands—men whom we obviously cannot train in six months or one year's time.

Tonight, the world consists of two armed camps and the peace which we had within our grasp at the end of World War II is fast slipping away and as of now we are at war. I repeat—as of now we are at war—a war which we are rapidly losing—losing not only in Europe but, what has been less publicized but equally important, losing it even more rapidly in Japan and Korea.

For the first time in history, Japan has members of its legislative body who belong to the Communist Party—five of them. Our Occupation Forces in Japan have legalized the Communist Party on

the theory that they will co-operate. In this connection, let me say that those who expect co-operation from the Communists must have completely blinded their eyes and closed their ears to what has happened in Western Europe, most recently Czechoslovakia.

Likewise, the Communists have practically taken over in Korea, in the Pacific area, another nation which we allegedly liberated. No one can question the correctness of this picture that I have painted.

The question which we are discussing tonight, therefore, is how to win the peace without war, if possible, and how to win the war if war does come?

This cannot be accomplished by weakness and indecision. As one of our truly great American statesmen, Harold Stassen, once said, "Russia will never co-operate with weakness and indecision. Only American firmness and power and strength will make her co-operate."

Ladies and gentlemen, that strength cannot be created or maintained by training a great mass of boys to be good squirrel hunters. If only the problem were that simple!

Now time is short, so I shall not dwell on the necessity of keeping abreast or ahead of the times technically and scientifically; of being prepared to wage or defend ourselves in bacteriological and atomic warfare; of building up our air forces and mechanized units; of having at all times

available, a mobile, well-balanced force. I believe we all agree on those facts.

I would like to dwell briefly—and I see my time is nearly ended—upon one phase of our preparation which has been completely neglected up until today. I refer to the complete lack of thought or planning for the defense of our major industrial areas if and when war comes. As you well know, if the United States and Russia were to commence a shooting war tomorrow, it is not only possible but very probable that Russia would take over Iceland and Alaska within a matter of weeks, thereby bringing practically every major American city within bomber range.

A few well-placed bombs in this country could completely wreck our communication and transportation systems and throw the major industrial areas into utter confusion. This points up the necessity of intelligently planning and then of properly training units for home defense.

The National Guard could well serve as the nucleus from which to work. By this I don't mean a National Guard merely trained to parade, but a National Guard to take over and supervise everything from fire fighting to handling transportation, communication, first aid, evacuation—in short—a unit capably trained to meet any emergency and to keep our industry operating. In conclusion let

me say that the creation of a powerful military force ready to wage war upon a moment's notice and the creation of an adequately trained home guard is a huge task and time is rapidly running out, running out while we are deviated from those two vitally important

issues as we prattle about UMT.

My good friends, the time has passed to dream and hope for an America powerful enough and wise enough to maintain a peaceful and prosperous world. Rather, we must now develop the power and the will and the driving force to make

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

HOMER PRICE RAINEY—Dr. Rainey, who in June, 1947, became president of Stephens College, ranks as one of the Nation's top educators. Dr. Rainey achieved prominence in 1927, when he became the youngest college president in the U.S., serving at that time as head of Franklin College in Franklin, Indiana. After four years, he became president of Bucknell College in Pennsylvania.

From 1935 to 1939, Dr. Rainey was head of the American Youth Commission in Washington, D.C., and from 1939 to 1944, he was president of the University of Texas.

A native of Clarksville, Texas, Dr. Rainey found no task too menial in achieving an education. He picked cotton and milked cows, and with a \$40 loan from his grandmother's Confederate pension was able to enter Austin College at Sherman, Texas. Here he received his Bachelor's degree and served as an instructor for a three-year period. His Master's and Doctor's degrees are from the University of Chicago. He also has several honorary degrees.

JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY — Elected Republican Senator from Wisconsin in November, 1946, he was formerly a circuit judge. He was born in Grand Chute, Wisconsin, in 1909, and is a graduate of Marquette University. From 1935 to 1938 he practiced law at Waupaca, Wisconsin, and has been a member of the firm of Eberlein and McCarthy at Shawano, Wisconsin, since 1938. In 1939, he was elected circuit judge. He is a member of the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

Senator McCarthy served in the U. S. Marine Corps with Air Force Intelligence in World War II. He was discharged as a captain in 1945.

DANIEL ALFRED POLING — Well-known as a clergyman, editor, and author, Dr. Poling was born in Portland, Oregon, in 1884. He has an A.M. and A.B. degree from Dallas (Oregon) College. He has also studied at Lafayette Seminary, and Ohio State University, and has honorary

degrees from many universities.

In 1912, Dr. Poling was the Prohibition party candidate for Governor of Ohio, and in 1916, he was temporary chairman of the Prohibition National Convention. From 1923 to 1930, Dr. Poling was pastor of the Marble Collegiate-Dutch Reformed Church in New York. Since 1936, he has been pastor of the Baptist Temple in Philadelphia.

During World War I, Dr. Poling was engaged in special war work in France, Germany, and the British Isles. He was a major in the Chaplain Officers' Reserves.

The editor of *Christian Herald*, Dr. Poling is the author of many books on religious and humanitarian subjects. He is also a member of many groups with similar interests. At present he is a member of President Truman's Advisory Committee on Military Training.

ARTHUR H. COMPTON — A physicist, Dr. Compton is chancellor of the Washington University. Born in Wooster, Ohio, in 1892, he received his B.S. and Sc.D. degrees from Wooster College, his M.A. and Ph.D. from Princeton, and also studied at Cambridge University in England. He has honorary degrees from many universities.

After a year as instructor of physics at the University of Minnesota, he became a research engineer at the Westinghouse Lamp Co. From 1920 to 1923, he was professor of physics and head of the physics department at Washington University, and from 1923 until 1929 was professor of physics at the University of Chicago, where from 1929 until 1945 he was the Charles H. Swift distinguished service professor. From 1940 to 1945, he was also chairman of the department of physics and dean of the division of physical sciences.

From 1942 until 1945, he was associated with the Atomic Project. Since 1945, he has been chancellor of Washington University in St. Louis.

Dr. Compton's honors, associations, and accomplishments in the field of science are too numerous to mention here. He is also the author of several books and many articles on scientific subjects.

those hopes and that dream come true. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Hitchcock:

Thank you, Senator McCarthy. Now if Dr. Poling and Dr. Rainey will join us here around the microphone, and if Dr. Compton will come in from St. Louis, we'll discuss the subject a little more before taking questions from our Memphis audience. Dr. Poling, would you like to start us off with a question or a comment?

Dr. Poling: Thank you, Mr. Moderator, yes, I would. I appreciate the generous words of Dr. Rainey and I reciprocate. I'm sorry he's on the wrong side tonight. I would like to know, however, why he suggests the President ignores the recommendations of the Civilian Advisory Commission. He not only does not ignore them, but specifically he accepts them and has recommended them to Congress. He did not particularize in the recent speech, but far from ignoring them, he accepts them and recommends them to Congress.

Mr. Hitchcock: Dr. Rainey, I don't know whether that's a question or a statement that you must answer.

Dr. Rainey: I have a definite reply to that. I listened to the President's speech and I read it afterwards, and I can find nowhere in that speech that he said anything about these other seven fac-

tors in your civilian report. He didn't mention them.

Dr. Poling: Definitely yes, because previously — evidently you did not read that—he made a complete recommendation to Congress in which he covered everything that was in our report.

Mr. Hitchcock: Senator McCarthy comes straight from Washington and maybe can tell us about that.

Senator McCarthy: I'd like to ask Dr. Compton a question over in St. Louis.

Dr. Compton: I'd be glad to make my comments, if you want to ask me.

Mr. Hitchcock: Go right ahead, Dr. Compton. You say you'll make a comment after he asks a question. All right, he'll do that.

Senator McCarthy: Dr. Compton, let me ask you this. Can you and I agree that six months or a year's training for World War II would be about equivalent to six weeks' training in preparation for World War I?

Mr. Hitchcock: Dr. Compton?

Dr. Compton: I would say that six months' training will be a very good backlog for additional training when we have to be called up for a fight. It seems to me that the psychological as well as the physical and mental training that one gets is going to be worth a good deal more than six weeks at the time. The psychological preparation is important, if you're going to get into a fight.

Mr. Hitchcock: Senator McCarthy is getting impatient. He wants to interrupt you, Dr. Compton. Let's let him say a word.

Senator McCarthy: Doctor, then do you and I agree that UMT will not prepare a single boy nor a single unit for war, that it's not an emergency measure, not the type of measure we should undertake when war is imminent, but rather, if justified at all, it'll be justified after the world situation levels off and there isn't this very, very imminent danger of war?

Dr. Compton: I'm afraid, Senator McCarthy, that I can't even agree to that. It seems to me that when war comes, you need not only these highly-trained men, that you speak of, in the fighting line—you do need those—but you also need, as you are pointing out, many hundreds of thousands—millions—of men, right here on the job to defend our home factories, to defend all of the cities against attack.

If a war comes, we are not going to be free to stand around and do things as we normally would in peacetime. We have to expect the attack from abroad.

The next war, if we get into it, is going to be one in which we are attacked. Our homelands, as you point out yourself, will not be free. That requires many men, but not necessarily the highly-trained men that go out into the fighting line. For that type of

purpose, the men who have received—

Mr. Hitchcock: Do you mind if I interrupt, Dr. Compton, for a second?

Dr. Compton: Yes, please do.

Mr. Hitchcock: Dr. Rainey here has another question that he wants to ask, and I think Senator McCarthy wants to come back at you here.

Dr. Rainey: No, I just want to keep the Doctor from filibustering. (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: All right. Dr. Rainey?

Dr. Rainey: It seems to me at this point it would help a great deal if we'd ask this question, and I'd like to have Dr. Poling answer it for us. What are the specific objectives of Universal Military Training?

Mr. Hitchcock: Dr. Poling, that's a specific question.

Dr. Poling: I'd like very much to repeat my speech, but I do not think there is time to do it. If Dr. Rainey did not hear it the first time, I'll give him a copy and he will read it. (*Laughter.*)

I have this question to ask Dr. Rainey. I've been inspired by what he said about the vast achievements that could come to us as a social adventure in this country, if we could spend the money for 2,000 hospitals each year, for 400,000 housing units, and the rest. I think he'll have to lift that five thousand dollars a little, though. Two of my sons came back from

the Pacific where they were in the Navy, and they could get houses for twice that amount. But my question is this: Dr. Rainey, do you oppose the expenditure of even vast sums of money directly for a military defense program?

Dr. Rainey: This is give and take. You ask me a question and I'll ask you one.

Mr. Hitchcock: We'll let Dr. Rainey answer the question and then we'll hear Dr. Compton's question in a minute. We didn't want to cut you off, Dr. Compton.

Dr. Rainey: I'll try to answer his question. He ducked mine. I'm not in favor of spending any money on Universal Military Training. I think we can spend it five times better on any other kind of program. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: All right. I think we're going to have to move along and get Dr. Compton's question. We may have a chance for you to say something later, Dr. Poling. Dr. Compton, do you have a question?

Dr. Compton: Yes, I would like to ask the Senator whether he agrees that for the purpose of home defense you need men who do not have necessarily the full training that you'd have for men in the fighting line?

Senator McCarthy: I can't hear you too well out here in Memphis, Doctor, but if I understood your question it is this: What type of training do I feel these units for

home defense should have? Is that your question?

Dr. Compton: That will do. Yes.

Senator McCarthy: Well, I think, Doctor, a completely different type of training from the front-line combat troops. In other words, let's take my city of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. If tomorrow you were to start an atomic or bacteriological war, you could drop a few bombs and knock out our complete transportation and communication facilities. I think our home guard should be trained, working with the engineers, working with the railroad companies, the doctors, the Red Cross, so that if and when war comes they can try to bring some order out of the resulting chaos so that we won't have utter confusion in this country. I believe that is equally important as training boys for front-line rifle shooting.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, gentlemen. I wish we had time for more questions; I see you all have them ready. But, now, while we get ready for our question period, I'm sure that you, our listeners, will be interested in the following message.

Announcer: You are listened to America's Town Meeting of the Air, originating in Ellis Auditorium in Memphis, Tennessee, where we're discussing the question, "Is Universal Military Training Necessary for Our Defense?"

We are about to take questions from our representative Town Hall audience.

If you would like a copy of tonight's broadcast, complete with the questions and answers to follow, send for the *Town Meeting Bulletin*, enclosing ten cents to cover the cost of printing and

mailing. If you would like to subscribe to the *Bulletin* for six months, send \$2.35; for a year, send \$4.50. Just address Town Hall, New York 18, New York, and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

Now for our question period we return you to Mr. Hitchcock.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Hitchcock: We are now ready for questions from this fine audience of some 4,000 people gathered here in Ellis Auditorium in Memphis. There are attendants in the aisles with portable microphones. Members of the audience are holding up number cards indicating the speaker to whom their question is addressed. May we hear first from the gentleman back there? Yes, sir, in the middle of the auditorium.

Man: Dr. Poling, you stressed UMT's religious value. Have not our courts recently reflected our collective belief that the state cannot safely be permitted any such intrusion?

Mr. Hitchcock: Would you repeat your question, please? We didn't quite get it here in the auditorium.

Man: You stressed, Dr. Poling, UMT's religious value. Have not our courts recently reflected our collective belief that the state cannot safely be permitted any such intrusion?

Mr. Hitchcock: The question, Dr. Poling, pertains to the religious values of UMT. Would you like to talk a little more to that point here while we get another question?

Dr. Poling: I should be very glad to talk to that point, but I did not hear the question itself. May I say as in my preliminary statement—my opening statement—never in the history of the defense program of any nation have moral safeguards, with opportunities for religious training under the several faiths, been provided as in this program—the program recommended by the Civilian Commission—not to take the place of the over-all program of church and home and school in the community, but to supplement that program—specifically a program for the trainee during the training period. If this does not answer the question, I am sorry I did not hear the question.

Mr. Hitchcock: I'm sorry that we're having a little difficulty with

noise here in the auditorium tonight because of the storm and so forth, but we'll maybe have a chance to come back to you a little bit later. Now we have another question out here. Will the gentleman there give us his question, please?

Man: Dr. Rainey. Statistics say that Russia has the largest air force today. You say the U. S. is largest. Can you be mistaken?

Mr. Hitchcock: Dr. Rainey? We're having a little difficulty with our questions here this evening. Would you mind giving us part of that question again so we can get the trend of it?

Man: Statistics say that Russia has the largest air force today. You say the U. S. is largest. Can you be mistaken?

Dr. Rainey: If I understand it, he says that the Russian air force is larger than our own. According to the figures that I've seen our air force is greater than the combined air forces of the rest of the world put together. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: All right, thank you, Dr. Rainey. Now we have another question back here. Yes, sir.

Man: This is a question for Dr. Compton.

Mr. Hitchcock: This is a question for Dr. Compton, which he, by the way, will be able to hear without any difficulty, because it goes over the air. Yes, sir.

Man: Would not military preparedness today require not one

million, but perhaps five or six millions of men? Is that kind of a program really advisable?

Dr. Compton: Military preparedness would really require millions of men. It requires millions of men because if we get into a real World War III, it will be a war that will take into account all the strength that we have in the Nation. We can't fight that war without having many trained men. It will take years for even Universal Military Training to get an initial start for that type of training. It is one of the reasons, as I see it, why the universal training is necessary.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Dr. Compton. Now we have a question for Senator McCarthy, I think. I see a No. 4 card over here.

Lady: Senator McCarthy. This is Mrs. Lee Richardson. Doesn't military training kill individualism, while compulsory study of our government would strengthen initiative and the will needed to return to a constitutional democracy?

Senator McCarthy: I'm terribly sorry. I just can't hear you in the first place, and I have difficulty in interpreting that Tennessee accent into Wisconsin, also. (*Laughter.*)

Lady: I'm from Milwaukee, too, Senator. (*Laughter and applause.*)

Senator McCarthy: I didn't hear that either.

Mr. Hitchcock: The humor was lost on Senator McCarthy because he wasn't even able to hear the

retort up here, but I'm sure it had something to do with his Northern Wisconsin accent.

Lady: Well, I'll use a Southern drawl.

Mr. Hitchcock: I wonder if you could get closer to your hand microphone out there and talk a little more slowly, so that we can hear you?

Lady: Doesn't military training kill individualism while compulsory study of our government would strengthen initiative and the will needed to return to a constitutional democracy?

Senator McCarthy: I frankly think this question of whether we should have military training or not must stand or fall, at this time, upon the question of whether or not it will best equip us to fight and win World War III if it does come. (*Applause.*) There are many arguments for and many arguments against. I believe that's the one all-controlling measure—will it help us to win World War III or not? As I have said before, I think it's the most inefficient way, the worst way, to build up a strong military force.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Senator. Dr. Poling wants to make a comment.

Dr. Poling: I wish to add this to what the Senator said—there is another question that joins here. Will Universal Military Training help keep us from World War III? I'm as much interested in

that question as I am in the other question.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Dr. Poling. Now, Dr. Rainey wants to ask a question.

Dr. Rainey: This is the question I've been wanting to ask Dr. Poling all evening. I would like for him to explain to us all how he can possibly say that Universal Military Training is a step toward disarmament?

Dr. Poling: Thank you, Dr. Rainey. I was afraid you would not ask that question. (*Laughter.*) Dr. Carl Compton, the chairman of our Commission, and five other members of the Commission belong to the Commission on Universal Disarmament. We have made a presentation to the United Nations through Senator Austin, our representative in the United Nations. We are specific. We believe that it will directly help toward disarmament—that it is a step toward disarmament.

I submit to you that only a strong nation—a nation with something to disarm can initiate and successfully promote a campaign for multilateral disarmament—for universal disarmament.

Mr. Hitchcock: Dr. Compton, would you like to comment on this little discussion that's going on at the moment?

Dr. Compton: It seems to me that disarmament is one of those things that has no meaning unless you are disarming among nations that are comparable in power. I

fail to see how we can expect, from what has happened, to find Russia agreeing to disarm, unless we ourselves are in a position where we can talk with vigor and with strength. Then we will be respected, and then only, it seems to me, can we expect to have a mutual disarmament between two nations. Unilateral disarmament is a thing that we just can't stand for.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Dr. Compton. Dr. Rainey wants a final word of rebuttal.

Dr. Rainey: If I get Dr. Poling's argument, it's this: that the way to disarmament is to arm ourselves to the teeth and then we can really disarm. I suppose that's all right. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Well, thank you, gentlemen. I think we've worked out a way now of getting these questions so that we can understand them here in the auditorium. We have had difficulty this evening. Here is a gentleman here who has a question, I think, for Dr. Poling.

Man: Dr. Poling, how would UMT be financed, with the taxes now in the process of being cut by Congress?

Dr. Poling: Provision for financing UMT is part of the total provision for the national defense. If UMT is regarded finally as essential and necessary, the American people will pay the bill. We must find it necessary first of all.

I wish to say this in addition

to what I've said right now. I challenge the statement that UMT and democracy are incompatible. I call attention to the fact that one nation has had both UMT and universal service for 136 years and has been at peace that long—and Sweden is at least as democratic as the United States of America. They are not incompatible. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Dr. Poling. Now this young lady has a question. Yes?

Lady: Dr. Rainey. Don't you think that communist infiltration into Europe and Asia has progressed and strengthened so that U. S. economic aid without military power cannot combat it?

Dr. Rainey: I think we ought to make a clear distinction in our minds, as I tried to in my first talk, between the enemies that we're fighting — whether we're fighting Russia, or whether we're fighting communism. We can stop Russia with military strength, but we certainly cannot stop the spread of ideas with guns and ships. (*Applause.*)

As I said, we may win every military engagement in which we take part, but that is no guarantee at all that it will stop the spread of communism; in fact, I believe it would even increase the spread of it.

Mr. Hitchcock: Dr. Poling wants to comment.

Dr. Poling: I wish to agree with Dr. Rainey as to the ultimate

triumph of ideas. Czechoslovakia, however, was founded upon that immortal truth. Something more remains to be said. Masaryk believed that immortal truth. Tonight, Czechoslovakia is the echo of a voice, and Masaryk is dead. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: All right. Thank you, Dr. Poling. Now we have a gentleman here who has been waving his card frantically for the last 10 minutes. He wants to ask Senator McCarthy a question and now is his chance.

Man: I would like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin: do you think, Senator, if the Administration had been firm with Russia on the heels of the last war, we would need UMT and a full draft at this date?

Senator McCarthy: Well, I get your question, and I gather that you're not a great Administration supporter. Neither am I, but I doubt whether this is time and place to go into it. But let me say that I disagree with my friend Dr. Rainey who is taking the same side of this question that I am, and I disagree with Dr. Compton and Dr. Poling. I think we must decide this question solely on one basis—that's this: Will UMT make this Nation stronger or not? Can you best spend the four or five billion dollars on training a great mass of men for six months or a year, or can you better spend that money training the experts and the

technicians which we'll so badly need when war comes. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: We have time, I think, for one quick question from the gentleman in army uniform here.

Man: I should like to ask Dr. Rainey: Can our salesmanship of democracy—making democracy attractive—the food we've sent, the supplies we have provided, be said to have stopped the idea of communism in Europe?

Mr. Hitchcock: You have about 30 seconds now for that, Dr. Rainey.

Dr. Rainey: No, we haven't stopped it, but that's the only hope, I think, that we have in the future for stopping it; as I said, to make our democracy mean more to the people of the world than communism or any other set of ideas can possibly mean.

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, very much, Dr. Rainey. I'm very sorry folks, but our time for the question period is up, even though we did have difficulty at the beginning of the period in hearing the questions from the audience. Now, while our speakers prepare their summaries of tonight's question, here is a special message of interest to you.

Announcer: The demand for Mr. Denny's pamphlet *What Can I Do?* continues to increase. Perhaps you, too, would like to read his answer to this question. All over America, people are organizing themselves as members of

clubs, discussion groups, lecture courses and political action groups—some good, some bad, some indifferent. There is a great resurgence of interest in public questions on the part of the people, but there is as yet no educational pattern which has taken form in the field of adult education comparable to schools and colleges for the more basic type of education.

Our Town Hall, in New York, is attempting to provide a pattern for a well-rounded center of adult education using lectures, short courses, seminars, and making full use of radio and motion pictures. Town Hall has issued a pamphlet written by Mr. Denny, containing a simple twelve-point program for everyone, answering the question, "What can I do?" If you would like a copy of this pamphlet, *What Can I Do?*, send 10c to Town Hall, New York 18, N.Y.

Now for the summaries of tonight's discussion, here is Mr. Hitchcock.

Mr. Hitchcock: Now, gentlemen, we are ready for the summaries of tonight's discussion. We will hear, first, from Senator Joseph McCarthy, who will review the position against Universal Military Training. Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCarthy: In summation, I'm first going to briefly quote from Dr. Rainey. "We believe that we cannot put our faith in military preparedness alone. There are other very important

factors which must be considered, such as our political relationships in the United Nations Organization and our intelligent relationship with other nations. UMT is based upon the unsound conception that we are fighting armies alone and not also fighting ideas. It is communism that is the enemy and we could win, we could win, every military engagement around the world and communism could and probably would continue to spread. We simply must fight ideas with better ideas. We must make democracy more attractive than communism or all the military strength in the world won't save us."

That's the end of Dr. Rainey's quote, and I think that's an excellent statement, Dr. Rainey. I believe Dr. Rainey and I also agree heartily that the training of a great mass of men for six months or a year would no more prepare them to fight World War III than training men for six days would have prepared them to fight World War I.

We feel that the thinking behind UMT is completely unrealistic and dangerous. If we are to have a powerful military force, we must look forward, not backward (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you Senator McCarthy. Now, for the other side of the issue, here is Dr. Daniel Poling with his summary for the affirmative.

Dr. Poling: Dr. Rainey said

lot of us are plain scared. Well, aren't we all? But tonight the affirmative presents a program not of fear but of faith—faith in democracy, faith in freedom, faith in America, faith in a free world. But faith without works—is dead, and, realistically, if ever war comes again, it will be universal conflict with universal mobilization, and universal mobilization without universal training would be confusion, panic, and disaster. Also, in the universal conflict, new and powerful weapons without UMT would be a delusion. UMT standing alone is inadequate, but without it, no other program could be made adequate.

It is necessary and imperative now to help make America secure, to enable us to discharge our obligations to the United Nations and to promote world security. It safeguards the morals of civilian trainees. It will save lives. Immediately it will strengthen the Marshall Plan.

Finally, as supported by Dr. Compton and the speaker, it is against war, toward universal disarmament and enduring world peace. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Hitchcock: Thank you, Dr. Poling, Joseph McCarthy, Homer Rainey, and Arthur Compton, for your spirited discussion tonight on a question of vital importance to every listener. Our thanks also to

our hosts here in Memphis, Lowenstein's Department Store and Station WMPS, and our special thanks to this fine Memphis audience for its enthusiastic participation in the discussion.

Next week, Town Meeting journeys to Beaumont, Texas, on the second leg of its spring tour which will take it to New Orleans, Louisiana; Columbia, South Carolina; Charlotte, North Carolina; Lexington, Kentucky; and Cleveland, Ohio.

Our subject next Tuesday will be "How Can We Meet the Challenge of Russia's Expansion in Europe?" Our speakers, Allen W. Dulles, New York attorney and member of the Executive Committee of the Committee for the Marshall Plan; the Honorable Ellis Arnall, former Governor of Georgia; Robert St. John, former foreign correspondent, and author of the new book *The Silent People Speak*; and James Frank Dobie, author and former professor of English at the University of Texas.

Be a Town Crier yourself, and use the modern Crier's bell, your telephone. Call your friends and remind them to tune in next week when George V. Denny, Jr., will return to moderate another important discussion. Make your plans to be with us next Tuesday and every Tuesday at the sound of the Crier's bell. (*Applause.*)



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 13

6. Are Communism and Christianity Incompatible?
7. What Should We Do About Prices and Rents?
8. Should We Admit 400,000 of Europe's Homeless Now?
9. How Can We Halt the Spread of Russian Power in Europe?
10. Has Twentieth Century Civilization Improved Mankind?
11. Will the Taft-Hartley Law Improve Labor Relations in Industry?
12. Is Universal Military Training Necessary for Our Security?
13. Can We Have An Effective World Organization Without Russia?
14. What Should Be Our Policy for Aiding Europe Now?
15. Is the Two-Party System Failing in America?
16. Have Women Failed As Homemakers?
17. Are We Giving Our American Indian a Square Deal?
18. Can Free Enterprise Here Compete With Socialism Abroad?
20. How Can We Make the United Nations Work?
21. How Can We Stop Rising Prices?
22. Should We Accept the New Fashions for Women?
23. On What Basis Can Our Differences With Russia Be Solved?
25. What Should We Do for Europe Now?
26. How Can We Keep America's Economy Free and Strong?
29. What Should We Do To Check Rising Prices?
31. What Future for Europe?
32. Are Civil Liberties Threatened in America?
33. How Can We Combat Anti-American Propaganda in Europe?
34. How Can We Maintain Prosperity and Avert Depression?
35. Is Christianity Losing to Materialism?
36. Which Road to Peace in 1948?
37. What Should We Do in China Now?
38. Should the President's European Recovery Plan Be Adopted?
39. How Can We Find Peace of Mind in This Atomic Age?
40. Should the President's Tax Plan Be Adopted?
41. Is Big Business Too Big?
42. How Can Peace Be Maintained in Palestine?
43. Are We Losing Our Moral Standards?
44. Should the St. Lawrence Seaway Plan Now Before Congress Be Adopted?
45. What's Wrong With the Comics?
46. Is Our Free Enterprise System Threatened by European Socialism?
47. Which Way America — Fascism, Communism, Socialism, or Democracy?
48. Should the President's Civil Rights Program Be Adopted?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: 26 Weeks for One **\$2.35** Single Copies 10c